

**Indiana University  
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL  
October 21, 2014  
IMU Georgian Room  
3:30 P.M. – 5:30 P.M.**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Joelle Bahloul, Marlon Bailey, Abhijit Basu, Purnima Bose, Andy Braden, Michelle Chung, Carrie Docherty, Lori Duggan, David Estell, David Fisher, Alyce Fly, Lessie Jo Frazier, Thomas Gieryn, Laura Ginger, Krista Glazewski, Gerhard Glomm, Margaret Gray, Dennis Groth, Daphna Rae Greiner, Brady Harman, Jeff Hass, Bradley Heim, Israel Herrera, Ed Hirt, Timothy Hoch, Cheng Kao, Jonathan Karty, Bradley Levinson, Karma Lochrie, Jon Lozano, Laura McCloskey, Patricia McManus, Joseph Miller, Sharlene Newman, John Paolillo, Jennifer Pearl, Jamie Prenkert, Deanna Reising, Ben Robinson, Leslie Rutkowski, Steve Sanders, Micol Seigel, Jim Sherman, Jon Simons, Jon Simons, Rebecca Spang, Geoff Sprinkle, Cassidy Sugimoto, William Swanson, Alex Tanford, Herb Terry, Frances Trix, Nona Watt

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:**

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** David Baxter, Nathan Ensmenger, Gretchen Horlacher, Jon Macy, Michael McRobbie, Lauren Robel, Catherine Sherwood-Laughlin, Mikel Tiller, Justin Vasel, Michael Wade, James Wimbush, Rega Wood, Sun-Un Yang

**GUESTS:** Alan Bender (Biology); Catherine Dyar (Office of the Provost); Ochmaa Escue (OVPDEMA); Jacqueline Kennedy-Fletcher (OFSA); Jenny Kincaid (OEVPVAA); Jim Gibson (21<sup>st</sup> Century Scholars Program); Bob Kravchuk (BAC Co-chair and SPEA); Mark McConahay (Registrar); Marsha Currin McGriff (Hudson & Holland Program); Martin McCrory (OVPDEMA); Jennifer Piurek (Office of the Provost); Ashleigh Sherman (IDS); MJ Slaby (Herald-Times); Ronda Stogsdill (OVPIED –Provost); Mary Tournier (Groups Scholars Program) Ed Vasquez (CWA Local 4730)

**Agenda**

1. Memorial Resolutions for Anita Aldrich and Edgar Williams

Anita Aldrich: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/14-15/B10-2015.pdf>

Edgar Williams: <http://www.inidiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/14-15/B11-2015.pdf>

2. Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)

(Faculty President Jim Sherman)

### 3. Question/Comment Period<sup>1</sup>

#### 4. Resolution on Academic Freedom (30 minutes)

(Professor Steve Sanders) [ACTION ITEM]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/14-15/B9-2015.pdf>

#### 5. Enrollment Report: Freshman Class Update and Recruitment and Funding for High Ability/Low Income Students (10 minutes)

(David Johnson, Vice Provost for Enrollment Management) [DISCUSSION]

<http://oem.indiana.edu/overview/2014>

#### 6. Recruitment and Funding for Underrepresented Students (30 minutes)

(David Johnson, Vice Provost for Enrollment Management; Professor Martin McCrory, Associate Vice President for Academic Support and Retention and Vice Provost for Educational Inclusion and Diversity; Jim Gibson, Director, Twenty-First Century Scholar Program) [DISCUSSION]

#### 7. Faculty Recruitment and Retention [DISCUSSION]

(Associate Vice Provost Claude Clegg) (20 minutes)

#### 8. Academic Guide Policy Migration [DISCUSSION]

(Chief Policy Officer Jenny Kincaid and Vice Provost Tom Gieryn) (20 minutes)

### Minutes

#### **AGENDA ITEM 1: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS FOR ANITA ALDRICH AND EDGAR WILLIAMS**

**SHERMAN:** Okay, I'd like to get the meeting started. As you notice and may remember, Lauren is in either Brazil or Chile right now on a South American business trip and won't be here today so I will try as best I can to preside over the meeting. One thing I will say ahead of time and I communicated this to people who are involved in the first item on the agenda after the initial period, that is, the resolution on Academic Freedom, that because of the number of people who are here for other issues, and the agenda has been set by time that item will not go beyond the thirty minutes allotted to it and I've told people this. And so if we reach that period and we're not ready for a vote then we'll simply either call the question, if people want to do that, or I hope someone will make a – a motion to table it until the next meeting. Not something I necessarily prefer to do, but if I see that it's going to go on and on there's no sense

---

<sup>1</sup> Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to President Sherman should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office. Our documents are available at: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/>. To send e-mail to the Faculty Council Office: [bfcOFF@indiana.edu](mailto:bfcOFF@indiana.edu)

having people show up here who can't come at any other Tuesday during the semester to show up and not appear on the agenda. So with that, we shall start the meeting as we usually do with Tom Gieryn reading memorial resolutions.

**GIERYN:** Minutes?

**SHERMAN:** Yes? Oh, are there – are there minutes? I don't think that there are.

**GIERYN:** Dr. Anita Aldrich was born in Elmo, Missouri, a small town in Nodaway County. Growing up on a farm greatly influenced her love of the outdoors and developed her passion for learning, teaching and helping others. She earned her bachelor's degree from Northwest Missouri State University in 1936, her master's degree from the University of Missouri (Kansas City) in 1946, and her Ed.D from Pennsylvania State University in 1957.

She began her teaching career in King City, Missouri, where she taught English, Health and Physical Education in both elementary and secondary schools. In 1953, she initiated her enduring administrative career as Supervisor of Health and Physical Education for the Kansas City Schools, and beginning in 1960 she served four years as Director of Elementary Physical Education and Secondary Girl's Physical Education and Intramurals. During this time, she spent several summers as a visiting professor at Utah State University and Indiana University. Through these early experiences, she developed a resilient passion for the advocacy of girls' and women's participation in physical activities and sports that paved the way for her momentous contributions to women's athletics in her various leadership roles at Indiana University.

When she joined the faculty of Indiana University's School of Public Health (formerly the School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation) in 1964, Anita Aldrich was well known as a leader in the advancement of women's athletics. She joined IU's faculty with a joint appointment as chair and professor of Physical Education for Women and as a professor of education. Later, she served as acting dean for one year, from 1975 to 1976. After the men's and women's departments of physical education were combined in 1977, she was appointed the first chair of the new Department of Physical Education. It was the first of several firsts for Aldrich. Most noted, she became the first woman member of the Indiana University Athletics Committee in 1971 and, after serving seven years, she was named the first woman to chair this committee, a position she held from 1978 to her retirement in 1985. On reaching the mandatory retirement age for administrators in 1980, she returned to teaching full time. She formally retired from IU in 1985.

While at IU, Aldrich was president of the Women's Faculty Club, an advisor for Stone Belt, a member of the Bloomington Faculty Council, and numerous other university committees. She

served on steering committees for the physical education curriculum guide “Motion and Direction” and for a Lilly Foundation study to determine the physical competencies of elementary school children. She was a member of the production committee for the “Physical Education College Facilities Guide” and a consultant to the Athletic Institute in production of the film “Careers in Physical Education.” She co-authored the revised edition of “Education through Physical Activities” in 1959. She was a member of the Education Policies Commission of the National Education Association and in 1961 was appointed as an advisor to President John F. Kennedy’s Fitness Council.

Among her many state, district, and national leadership positions, Aldrich served as president of the Missouri Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation and president of the Central District of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, and finally, as president for the American Association (now the Alliance) for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. She also was on the on the editorial board of the *Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation*.

Her many honors include induction to the Indiana University Athletic Hall of Fame. She received acknowledgments as the Distinguished Alumni Achievement Award from the University of Missouri at Kansas City; the Leadership Recognition Award from the Indiana Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance; the Honor Award from the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance; and an award for Outstanding Service in the Advancement of Athletics from the Athletic Institute. She was named an Honor Fellow of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance and was elected to the American Academy of Physical Education. Aldrich is listed in *Who’s Who in America*; *Who’s Who in the United States*; *Who’s Who in the Midwest*; *Leaders in Education*; and *Outstanding Educators of America*.

In 2005, the School of Public Health established the Anita Aldrich Distinguished Alumni Award to annually honor a recipient who personifies the ideals of Anita Aldrich — demonstration of outstanding achievements, professional excellence, service to the community, and loyalty to Indiana University, all while making a significant difference in the lives of girls and women relative to participation in sports, fitness activities and healthy lifestyles.

After retirement from IU, Anita continued to serve the Bloomington community. For nearly two decades, she worked at the Salvation Army sorting and distributing clothing and goods and knitting thousands of mittens over the years for those in need. She delivered Meals on Wheels until unable to drive. She also extended her love of working with adults to Monroe County Public Library’s Volunteers in Tutoring Adult Learners (VITAL) Program as a tutor and also on

the board of directors.

All those who were privileged to interact with Anita would acknowledge that they were fortunate to have had the opportunity to experience her wisdom, spirit of service, academic professionalism. She was one of the true pioneers in the effort to achieve gender equity in intercollegiate athletics.

Ed Williams served as a faculty member and administrative leader at IU for a half a century. Born in rural Poseyville, Indiana, Ed never lost his Hoosier accent, love for fishing, and dedication to the closest baseball team, the St. Louis Cardinals. He attended nearby Evansville University where he played basketball and football, graduating in 1947 with a BA in economics/political science after three years of service in the U.S. Army Medical Corps in World War II. He then moved to Bloomington, where he spent the rest of his life, to attend IU, earning both an MBA and DBA. He was immediately invited to join the faculty of the Kelley School of Business, where he moved up the academic ranks to become professor of management. He was an effective teacher and especially enjoyed challenging students in case analysis. He provided personnel and management consulting to a large number of major organizations including Farm Bureau Insurance, Texaco, and Mead Johnson. He travelled widely internationally for consulting and IU engagements, visiting England more than 50 times. His major mark, though, at Indiana University would be through a variety of critical administrative posts. He first was the chair of what was then called the Department of Personnel and Organizational Behavior. He was associate dean of the business school at a critical time when it got its first building of its own, moving from what is now Woodburn Hall to the currently being renovated Hodge Hall at Tenth Street and Fee Lane. He was soon tapped by president Joseph Sutton and then president John Ryan to several increasingly responsible posts in Bryan Hall, but he still found time to teach at least one course every semester. He always viewed his positions as serving the president, once describing his role in an IDS article as, "I view my job as a lieutenant in the army. I do things which the chief executive officer wants me to do." Most notably in this liaison role was his service as an intermediary between several presidents and the fiery and somewhat unpredictable Bob Knight, the coach of the men's basketball team.

Ed served as vice president for administration and later as vice president for finance and chief financial officer of the university. In the 1970s he reorganized the university to centralize some functions such as information and finances, while decentralizing most of the academic matters down to the campus level. Later he supported efforts to further decentralize operations down to the academic unit level. He had a reputation as a powerful force in the university, but in the IDS interview he responded, "I never think about influence...never think about acquiring more responsibility or authority. The president calls the shots, but it's a team effort. If you can't

subordinate your own interests as a team member, you ought to get off it.” In this IDS interview, which by the way was written by IDS columnist Mark Kruzan in 1980, the first topic was Williams’ legendary blunt nature. Living up to his reputation, Ed remarked, “This is the first interview of this kind I’ve given in a long time. if it doesn’t come out as I think it should, it will be the last. I’ve always said you shoot square with me and I respect you, or I don’t deal with you.”

In a separate IDS interview, he summed up his administrative work with, “I’d like to do such a good job...that the next guy has it easier to do, but it will be difficult for him to do it any better.” This was something that he really did accomplish.

He officially retired from IU in 1988. However, he was immediately asked to serve as special advisor to the president for intercollegiate athletics. Upon the death of athletic director Ralph Floyd in late 1989, Ed served as interim athletics director until a successor could be named. A few years later he was tapped to serve as acting assistant vice president for Human Resources Management upon the resignation of Margaret Mitchell in late 1994.

Ed’s support for IU, fairness, and doing the right thing is illustrated by his actions at the 1990 Peach Bowl when IU was playing Auburn. Ed learned that the Peach Bowl leaders offered a better financial deal for Auburn than they did for IU regarding unsold tickets. Ed notified Coach Bill Mallory not to bring the team onto the field until the issue was resolved. Just 15 minutes before kick-off IU was given the same arrangement as Auburn and then the IU team came onto the field, unfortunately to lose in an exciting game 23-27.

Ed received numerous Indiana University and national honors. From IU he received the President’s Medal, the Thomas Hart Benton Medal, the Distinguished Alumni Service Medal, and election to the IU Athletics Hall of Fame. He was awarded two Sagamores of the Wabash by Indiana governors. He received an Alumni Excellence Award from the University of Evansville and was elected to Beta Gamma Sigma and Sigma Iota Epsilon, business honoraria.

Ed is survived by his wife of 68 years, Professor Emeritus Joyce Williams. Ed and Joyce were classmates in Poseyville, where Ed graduated high school at the class valedictorian and Joyce was right behind him as salutatorian. Ed also leaves two children, Cynthia and Tom, both in Bloomington and two grandchildren, Meghan and Jaimee.

## **AGENDA ITEM 2: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**SHERMAN:** [All stand in silence] Thank you. [All sit] Okay, I’ll make some comments and review a couple of the things that were discussed at the Executive Committee meeting last Thursday, I believe. So my first comment is about an e-mail that all BFC members received. I think it was at the end of last week with – where – where one of the things we’re trying to do this year is

have the elections of subsequent officers of BFC occur in a more timely way than has been the case in the last few years. So an initial e-mail went out asking BFC members to nominate current members for BFC president if they would become the president-elect-elect, I guess at this point. And it was a list of names of BFC members, unfortunately three or four names were left off the list. I'm not clear why at this point, but Craig will send out a revised list that does include everyone to be nominated. Now nothing – nothing bad has happened because of this. We have a reasonably long period of collecting nominations and trying to convince people who are so nominated to actually run. So this will go on for a while, so I apologize for the omission of some names but you will get an updated list and I hope it won't happen again. The second item I want to talk about is one that was discussed at the Executive Committee meeting last week and also at a teleconference this morning of the UFC Executive Committee, and that involves the adoption sometime in the reasonably near future I think of a – of a – of a – amended sexual misconduct policy. So there are – there are two – there are obviously – there's – there's an administrative committee that's working on this that I know Emily Springston is very active on and Jenny Kincaid as well, and I know that it includes faculty members because Peter Finn is in the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences is a member. But in addition to that committee there are two other faculty committees that are working hard at this. One committee was formed at the – the suggestion of the Executive Committee of the UFC a couple of weeks ago, and it was decided that there should be a university-wide committee that focuses primarily on faculty sexual misconduct because the – the Office of Civil Rights when they came here seemed pretty much concerned with student sexual misconduct, especially student on student sexual assault, violence, et cetera... And had a lot less to say or think about faculty sexual misconduct although an adopted policy will have implications for what happens with faculty who either accuse or are accused of sexual misconduct. So we are pretty much done forming this committee. There'll be six people on the committee, two from Bloomington, and the two from Bloomington will be myself and – and Laura McCloskey. Two from Indianapolis, and Marianne Wokeck has chosen someone from the Psychology Department who – who focuses on labor disputes, and someone from the law school, and there will be two people from the regional campus that will be selected within the next day or two, and once the committee is chosen we'll have a tele-call or a Skype session, and send out a memo to all faculty and as quickly as we can set up a meeting with Emily Springston and – and Jenny Kincaid. So the focus of this six person committee will be on primarily on faculty misconduct, although it will – there'll probably be some issues of student misconduct that – that crop up. At the same time there is a committee that some number, six or so, members of this body have formed, a working committee that will focus primarily on student sexual misconduct. They're working with the Student Affairs Committee, and I believe that that group will meet with Emily Springston. Is that tomorrow? Can someone verify?

**MCCLOSKEY:** Tomorrow.

**SHERMAN:** It's tomorrow? Yeah. So they're already off and running, and they'll focus on the student side, and both of these have to be perhaps changed because of federal law or guidelines, and because we want to make them more clear and consistent. I – I would add to that that last week, last Friday, within the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences we had a day of, I guess, celebration of alumni, and alumni came and some gave some presentations, there were awards, current faculty gave talks. One of the talks of a former alumna focused on her research, her name is Teresa Treat and she's at the University of Iowa now, and her research focuses on student on student sexual assault, why it occurs, why it occurs as much as it does, and what interventions can be done and I – I found it to be a fascinating talk. In a – in a nut shell she finds that the proximal cause of many sexual assaults is a misreading by college-age men of what women are wanting or feeling. They mistake other emotions as sexual interest, and perhaps it's a projection of the males own sexual interest projected onto the woman whom they're – at whom they're looking. At any rate a – a prior cause of the misperception and misjudgment, as you might expect, alcohol plays a big role in it. And Teresa has developed some interventions to reduce the amount of misperception and misreading by young men of women's facial expressions and body expressions, and again, I found the research to be both interesting and potentially valuable. If someone on that committee will remind me, I'll be happy to send you links or sites to the research that Teresa has published. So you might find it useful. I did.

Next, as you're all aware I think, the university-wide strategic plan has now been put out there. The president did this last week I believe, and it is – it will be taken up by the Board of Trustees at the December 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> meeting. Faculty have until November 22<sup>nd</sup> for suggestions and concerns and – and issues that you might want to raise. You can find the university strategic plan online easily. John Applegate wants to conduct a forum at each and every IU campus prior to that so that he can hear faculty input and do a brief presentation along with Michael Rushton, and he wants to have this all done by the first week in November so preliminarily in – in talking to some –

**LEVINSON:** December.

**SHERMAN:** – people on the Executive Committee –

**LEVINSON:** You mean December.

**SHERMAN:** Excuse me?

**LEVINSON:** You mean [comment indistinct] by the first week of December.

**SHERMAN:** By November, yeah.



**SPANG:** Wow.

**KARTY:** You mean nine days from now – or ten days?

**SHERMAN:** No – no November 14<sup>th</sup> or so, a month. A little under a month. But in talking to people on the Executive Committee it seems like the only feasible times that we could do a forum with John and Michael might be the hour before the Faculty Council meeting on November 4<sup>th</sup> or 18<sup>th</sup>. Those meetings are already full. The agendas are full, so we may well go ahead with that if John and Michael can work that into their schedule. Remember, this is the university-wide strategic plan, not the Bloomington strategic plan. So it's much less specific. It's broader. It's more abstract. It's more general. I – I think people who have looked at it say that there's nothing in the university plan that in any way conflicts with what we've put forth in the Bloomington plan, so I think it's of less relevance to us than the Bloomington plan is, but still of some importance. And because the agenda's full today I think I'll – I'll just stop there. And I did not get any questions or comments communicated to me by e-mail, but if there are comments out there of importance and relevance... Yeah, John?

### **AGENDA ITEM 3: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD**

**PAOLILLO:** What's the status of the campus strategic plan now that there's a university strategic plan? Because there was a – it was – it was not official in some [comment indistinct] –

**SHERMAN:** Yeah, is it – is it not? It's semiofficial?

**TERRY:** That would be my interpretation. I mean, we were told that the president had not approved the Bloomington plan because he was awaiting approval of the university plan, but the university plan is out in draft form for comment. So I assume until the Trustees approve the university plan this one remains unofficial, but being pursued by, not only the administration, but by groups like our shared governance group.

**SHERMAN:** Yeah, I think we had a long period of input and discussion. John Applegate came here and Michael Rushton, and we've had several meetings. Yep?

**TERRY:** I was able to attend the – the president's State of the University Address though, and I would say that while there's no conflict that I perceive between the university strategic plan and the campus strategic plan, there are at least two of the president's objectives in there that are very important for the Bloomington campus. One is the announcement that since Dean Gonzalez is going to step down as – as dean, that the president plans a major review of how higher education related to education takes place at Indiana University. And while the proximate cause of that is the retirement of Dean Gonzalez who serves as a core campus dean of Bloomington and IUPUI, all of – I think all but one or two of the regional campuses have

education programs, and they will be studied in this, too. So it's going to be a major review of what this campus and everything else in the system does with higher – with schools of education. And the second thing was the president noted that the faculty of Studio Art and Apparel Merchandising and Interior Design on the Bloomington campus have approved merging to become a kind of a school of art and design with the faculty in Art History remaining as a department in the College of Arts and Sciences, and the school would like the Hope School of Fine Arts now to be a part of the College. He linked that to a general idea that, Bloomington especially, should do more about developing programs about making things and in the course of that indicated – he actually used the – the dreaded “e” word. He talked about engineering, indicating that at the very least we would look at doing engineering sort of in the context of Computer Science and that sort of thing, but maybe something broader, I don't know. So – so that while the plan is a university plan and fairly broad there are those two things we're going to take a hard look at education and we're going to do something related to engineering at Bloomington that – that matter, and so if we do have a forum or something I hope people will come and – and those who are interested I hope they'll go read the plan and comment on it.

**SHERMAN:** Okay, so that we can kind of get started –

**SPANG:** Jim, there's a hand over there.

**SHERMAN:** Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, please?

**BAILEY:** I just want to briefly go back to your comments about sexual misconduct just to remind my colleagues that sexual misconduct and sexual violence is not just about sexual misessaging, it's also about actual violence and a need to force people to comply and to submit. And it also happens to the LGBT community. So I do not want this conversation on the committee or throughout the campus to just involve sexual violence that does not include the sexual violence that is homophobic and transphobic, and [comment indistinct]-based –

**SHERMAN:** Thank you.

**BAILEY:** – and I think that that needs to be a part of the discussion always.

**SHERMAN:** Yeah, thank you. Thank you, Marlon. Appreciate that. Okay, let's get back to the resolution on academic freedom that we began discussion a couple of weeks ago. And Steve, you did a presentation of the resolution that's before us, and if you'd maybe go through that again, that would be helpful.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 4: RESOLUTION ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM**

**SEIGEL:** [comment indistinct] thirty minutes, right?

**SPANG:** I think we need it presented.

**SHERMAN:** Know what?

**SANDERS:** It has been moved and seconded, so...

**SPANG:** Okay.

**SHERMAN:** Yeah, it's already on the table.

**SANDERS:** Do you want a refresher or not?

**SHERMAN:** Yeah, please. Unless people don't want it, I think it's really important to remind people of what it is and why it is.

**SANDERS:** Okay. Just briefly, this resolution grows out of a concern that's been expressed by a number of people in this Council as well as on the campus about academic freedom threats at other universities that have been manifested. The Steven Salaita affair at the University of Illinois is perhaps the best known, but Salaita is not the only concern of organizations that are monitoring threats to academic freedom. I mentioned two weeks ago the case of Loretta Capeheart that I had been involved with at Northeastern Illinois University. The case of a Colorado State University professor who lost his e-mail access over critical statements that he had made about an administration plan related to firings, to Chicago State University, which has been trying to shut down a faculty blog that's critical of the administration there. Faculty governance and academic freedom are intertwined and that's the resolution before you underscores these two points. It underscores that responsibilities for policies and individual hiring decisions are vested primarily in the faculty. This is not merely a statement of philosophy, the resolution makes specific citations to places in the Faculty Constitution that outline the authority of the faculty over these decisions and the involvement of faculty members in hiring decisions as well as policies related to tenure, promotion, dismissal and so forth. Secondly, the resolution underscores existing academic freedom policies on this campus by saying that faculty have the same rights and duties as other citizens to participate responsibly in debates, not only through scholarly communications, but on all matters of public concern. The university policy states flatly that in matters of public utterances our faculty, librarians, "shall be free of institutional control." That policy goes on to counsel in a way that's precatory not mandatory, that fitting a place that values itself as being an open, neutral forum to all comers, an academic community should also be a marketplace of ideas, and so teachers and librarians should recognize a professional responsibility to be accurate, to exercise appropriate restraint, to show respect for others in the expression of their views. There – another version of a resolution was offered to the Executive Committee, Ben Robinson, a member of the Executive Committee drafted it. This is an issue I've taken an interest

professionally and academically in for a long time. I mentioned last time that, you know, when I say that I devote a lot of my *pro bono* practice to issues of academic freedom, is largely because of my experience on this campus and values I feel it instilled in me. I drafted an alternative resolution, which was ultimately recommended by the Executive Committee. I simply suggest that this resolution comports with existing Indiana University policies, underscores not only the traditions of this campus, but the policies that have been repeatedly reaffirmed by this Council, by the University Faculty Council, by the Board of Trustees. Some of you may feel it's more cathartic to make a statement about academic freedom that is more confrontational or more overtly political. That's your prerogative to consider that kind of wording or that language. I do think that this resolution is firmly grounded in the traditions, the history and the policies of this campus, while recognizing it is not our place to re-litigate questions that have taken place on other campuses, it is our responsibility to safeguard and underscore our own traditions. So, with that, thank you for allowing me to briefly recap and speak in favor of the resolution.

**SHERMAN:** Ben?

**ROBINSON:** Thank you, Jim, and thank you, Council, and thank you, Steve. I mean as – as Steve mentions there was another resolution drafted. I submitted it, and this one was chosen to go forward, but I do want to quickly give some background and explain why – and I don't think it's confrontational, but I want to explain first of all some background why the resolution came up and I want to recommend that we either amend the resolution that Steve put forward or – or reject it as written with all due respect to the good intentions and your involvement with these issues because I think – Steve and I also corresponded considerably during this – so there's definitely part of an ongoing conversation, but I think it's important to make clear that some of the general background to it. The first issue, I would say the most general, is that I think we recognize that higher education in many respects is increasingly becoming a private good not a public good, and I don't – you know, and we can talk about that for a long time, so I just want to mention it briefly because I think it's a horizon that a lot of us see ourselves confronted with but I think there are more concrete issues that – that are – that make it necessary for us to propose some sort of resolution. Again, I would say either an amended or a different version, but some sort of resolution addressing academic freedom. Two of those contexts are a Supreme Court case in 2006, the *Garcetti v. Ceballos* case that held that statements by public employees are not protected by the First Amendment. And this decision in 2006 has been of particular concern of faculty councils across the United States, maybe most famously the faculty council at Minnesota, but it has also been the source of many statements by the AAUP, and I want to allude to one of those statements in just a second. But that's one background, in other words, faculty academic freedom is being increasingly viewed by the courts as something that has to be subordinated to our role as employees, and I think that calls for a response. The second thing that I mention simply because David is here today because it has to do with

enrollment management, but as increasingly the funding per student FTE goes down from state appropriations, we're more and more reliant on private sources of revenue, and that also makes us more vulnerable to private pressure even though we are a public institution with first amendment protection, or at least had these protections under earlier Supreme Court precedents. So the risk that I want to point out and to which a resolution – again an amended resolution – could intervene would be one that sees us increasingly as employees subject to administrative constraint, and that's the – that is what we want to clarify. So it is not to criticize past policy. I agree with Steve that we should affirm past usages. It is not to criticize and be confrontational with our administration, and indeed it is not to re-legislate. I agree on all of those matters, but it is needed to clarify the interpretation of precedent in the new context in which we are in. More specifically, and Steve already mentioned it, the Salaita case withdrew employment from Steven Salaita. And I won't go into the details, but without – and it was clearly perceived by the Center on Constitutional Rights [sic] and many professional organizations and councils, that they rescinded his offer as a penalty on speaking out on an issue of public concern, and that applies to all of us with this background of the *Garcetti* case – that it is all of our affairs. It is not just a regional, Illinois affair, and we have to answer that strongly if we want to be true to our mission of faculty governance in this new era. A second case, though, very recently this Christmas, IU President McRobbie, de-listed IU's membership from the American Studies Association without consulting the affected department. Again, this is a dangerous precedent. We might have different views on the case, but it is certainly dangerous that this happened over a similar matter of public concern as the Salaita case here at our own institution so recently without any repercussions for the administration from the side of faculty. I look at that again as an urgent matter for this body. Finally, most – finally, actually, I want to just go back to what I said at the beginning the AAUP response to the *Garcetti* case. They put the challenge very clearly as something that is in the court of faculty councils. They said, in their 2009 report *Protecting an Independent Faculty Voice*, they said, "we reiterate the imperative of making the case for academic freedom, not as a matter of law, but as a principle vital to the effective functioning of higher learning." "It is incumbent on faculty," and now I'm – I'm quoting again from the AAUP report, "to make administrators and governing boards aware of the risks to higher education." I think that is what we're intervening in in this moment, not hostility to the administration, but we want to set a clear signal that this is how past precedent will continue to be interpreted in this new environment both here at our institution and at institutions nationwide. For that reason, I advocate that we amend the resolution for a somewhat stronger voice appropriate to the situation, or if we're not able to agree on amendments, then I recommend that we vote it down. And I'll let others speak to the amendment. I – I don't have an amendment to offer, but others – others do have – I know of at least four such amendments, so I'll cede the floor, and again thank – thank you Steve for bringing it to the floor.

**SHERMAN:** Yeah, please.

**GREINER:** Thank you, Steve, and thank you, Ben. So I actually would like to propose an amendment which involves actually restoring some of the language in the current UFC policy, AC-32, from which the resolution currently quotes a portion of that policy but not the entire thing, and so you should have it in your packet. So, the amendment that I'm proposing is that we would restore the third sentence of the ACA-32 Statement – UFC Policy Statement on Academic Freedom. This is the sentence that reads, "No limitations shall be placed upon the teacher's and librarian's freedom of exposition of the subject in the classroom, or library, or on the expression of it outside." And I think that last phrase is really key. It's a strong statement, and it's already part of UFC policy, so I propose that we just re-introduce that language into the resolution. The second thing would just be to restore the missing information that's now currently in the [comment indistinct] UFC's, only for the reasons of transparency, I think. It's not that important to me that we say that, "an endeavor should be made to avoid appearing as a spokesperson for the University," but nevertheless, I think just for reasons of transparency to – to restore that bit of language, and so that the ellipses are not so mysterious.

**SHERMAN:** So were those two separate amendments or –

**GREINER:** I – I do not know how it works. Maybe.

**SHERMAN:** – a single amendment?

**GREINER:** [comment indistinct] what it is.

**SHERMAN:** One amendment.

**SANDERS:** Do you mind if I speak?

**SHERMAN:** Yes, please.

**SANDERS:** Yes, so. I – I formally sort of ceded my role as parliamentarian during this assuming that that would be most appropriate. Technically, there is no such thing under Robert's Rules as a friendly amendment, that is, any amendment is supposed to be adopted by the group as a whole. If we want to overlook that since we're sometimes a little bit loose, I am perfectly happy to accept those as friendly amendments without a vote unless, I – I guess if un – someone feels strongly the other way and objects to it, I'm perfectly willing to just say I accept those as friendly amendments.

**SPANG:** As secretary – since I suppose I am the one responsible for keeping track of how this plays out – Rae, did you propose that the third sentence, no limitation shall be placed upon the

teacher's, et cetera..." should be entered immediately after, "and which states in relevant part..." so it's part of that quotation? Is that where you want that?

**GREINER:** Yes? Yes.

**SPANG:** Okay, got it.

**SANDERS:** When I – when I drafted this, my intention was to focus on what I had understood was the matter of most concern to people, and that is extramural statements by faculty and subjects outside their area of concern, but I think it's perfectly appropriate. This – that's what the policy already says, my resolution is underscoring that policy. As I said, I guess, subject to the chair's approval, or any objections, I would just suggest – I would recommend we accept those as friendly amendments.

**SHERMAN:** Okay.

**KARTY:** I would ask that they – I heard the first part about sentence three. I missed the second part. My colleague [comment indistinct] but someone else may have missed it – the second half of that was. So could you repeat it?

**SPANG:** The second of Rae's amendment is the – Professor Greiner, sorry – of her proposed amendments is that the ellipsis in the section that's quoted from faculty ACA-32, –

**KARTY:** Yes, yes.

**SPANG:** – Faculty Council ACA-32 – that ellipsis should be removed and the full sentence should be quoted simply for the sake of transparency.

**KARTY:** Thank you.

**SHERMAN:** Okay, unless there are objections, let us take the – the resolution now to be the one as amended by these changes. Okay, that was smooth. Please.

**LEVINSON:** I – I – I continue, I think that if we're going to take the time and the trouble to make a resolution that I concur quite with Ben's point of view in that, in the current climate, I think one of the key concerns has to do with the interpretation of so-called civility is not a term that's actually used in this policy. It certainly has been a term that's been used in later on Salaita, and in recent California system and in other places, and a similar term is "responsibility." And so there's this phrasing – there's the phrasing about the idea of participating responsibly in the very first clause, and then again, the phrase about exercising appropriate restraint seems to me, in this climate in this moment, those are the aspects of the current policy which was passed I note in 2005, before the Supreme Court's decision was made that don't really, adequately, attend to the cases that we're seeing where precisely the charge of incivility or irresponsibility

or lack of restraint is that which is been used to – to, in the case of Salaita, to revoke an offer of hire and other instances that we’re seeing. So I think if we’re going to take the trouble we really need to not call attention to the language of the original policy which is – which – which does conceivably give license to administration, quite honestly, to – to in fact infringe upon our freedom of expression outside the classroom, and we should really not be repeating the phrase, “exercise appropriate restraint,” and I would say we should strike the phrase “responsibly...” and just say [comment indistinct] to participate... in debates.” Because we all know that “responsible” is a great matter of interpretation and for one person to be acting responsibly to where to a certain constituency can be interpreted as being violating responsibility vis à vis another [comment indistinct]. So I – I guess I’m saying – I’m – personally, I’m not prepared to vote in favor of this resolution. [comment indistinct] I would want to see – call this another amendment – I would want to see the term “responsibly” struck, and the term ‘accuracy’ is also problematic [comment indistinct].

**FISHER:** If – if – if – if I may – if I could have – okay, help me out. I’m sorry to –

**LEVINSON:** Sure, feel free.

**FISHER:** I – I was about to offer an amendment that was going to be amended – to strike the final sentence of the current resolution, which is the precatory language from the academic freedom policy. So this sentence that includes your “appropriate restraint” and “accurate” comments, it starts, “The teacher or librarian or librarian should recognize,” and continues, “that a professional position in the community involves the obligation to be accurate, to exercise appropriate restraint, and to show respect for the rights of others to express their views.” I would offer the amendment, I guess, minding my thoughts with Bradley’s, I offer the amendment that we strike both that sentence and the word “responsibly” from the first sentence. I hadn’t thought about this word “responsibly” yet before Bradley mentioned it. Or I’m not going to comment on that, but I just want to say, in terms of striking the precatory language from the resolution I think there are several important reasons to do that in addition to the one that Bradley mentioned, and one of which is that the phrase addition no longer indicates that we’re quoting mostly the precatory language from the academic freedom resolution, but we’re still giving it a lot of extra weight. You know, any – any actual policy – I like the actual policy. I didn’t think I did the first time I read it, but I think it’s a very carefully constructed document, and so I think quoting particularly that precatory language out of context is far too much weight to things we’re supposed to be doing, and far too little weight to how we’re supposed to be protected and it also, quoting it out of context, leaves you not knowing for instance that in the policy – if you look at the policy, which – which I asked Craig to give us all a copy of, put in a final sentence in the policy that is the enforcement clause of the policy. And – and the enforcement clause of the policy only mentioned violations of academic



freedom, and makes it clear that this sentence that we have currently in our resolution is precatory because there's no enforcement clause for violation, and so I really think this entire sentence should just go because out of context I think it's much less clear than precatory and in addition to, as Bradley mentioned, in the new context we're in, it's a much more dangerous sentence and so I would propose that the amendment that says we strike that final sentence, and we strike the word "responsibly" in the first sentence.

**SHERMAN:** So you're putting that forth as a – as a single amendment?

**FISHER:** Yes.

**SHERMAN:** And Bradley, do you second it?

**LEVINSON:** I second my colleague's proposal.

**SHERMAN:** Okay, so we now have an amendment on the floor that requires discussion if there is any. Yes?

**ROBINSON:** Let me just say, very briefly say, I mentioned the AAUP 2009 report and they give the example of the University of Minnesota's resolution, and the Subcommittee A of the AAUP also was a recommendation, and in both cases "to speak and write without institutional discipline or restraint,"<sup>2</sup> that's Minnesota, their own proposal. "Professors should have freedom to address the larger community with regard to any matter social, political, economic, or other interest without institutional discipline or restraint."<sup>3</sup> So the amendment is consistent with the AAUP 2009 recognitions to strike the words of "restraint."

**SHERMAN:** Yeah.

**SPANG:** So – I am concerned that – I mean I understand what motivates this proposal – and I would certainly understand it if it were a proposal to amend the policy, but we're not writing policy. We're quoting. And so I'm afraid that what we would do if we passed this amendment would be to misquote and misrepresent the policy, and I don't want us to do that. I want us to say this is what the policy is because otherwise we're keeping information from people who may not bother to look up the full – the full policy.

**SHERMAN:** Micol?

**SEIGEL:** I want to support David's and – Dave and Bradley's amendments by expanding on the discussion of precatory language, right? There are "shalls" in academic policy 32 and there are "shoulds." "Shalls" dictate in the imperative what must happen. "Shoulds" suggest best

---

<sup>2</sup> [http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/aft/1112aft\\_white\\_paper.pdf](http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/aft/1112aft_white_paper.pdf) p.2

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.aaup.org/file/Protecting-Independent-Voice.pdf> p. 88

practices which are not required, and this is what David means by “precatory.” So what is really policy, what is holding policy, what is, you know, what we believe must be obeyed are “shalls.” The “shoulds” are merely advisory. To emphasize them is to distort the existing policy, the policy that sets down actual requirements is all contained in sentences beginning with “shall,” and so I think that Rebecca your – your objection is – it is perhaps mistaken with the difference between “shall” and “should.” The important parts of the policy are the first ones that actually hold the university to certain practices of ensuring academic freedom, so that’s why I think it’s okay to quote from some and not the rest of the policy. The policy is widely available to everybody, you know, obviously the executive council thought it was okay to quote part of it, but what we’re seeing with these amendments I think is to recognize that what you select to quote influences very much how the resolution will be interpreted and I think we are remaining truest to the written policy by emphasizing the parts that begin with “shall” and taking out the much – much less carefully guaranteeing of academic freedom and less disciplinarily holding parts of it that we should.

**SHERMAN:** Okay, let – can – I’d like to clarify something with David and Bradley. How does this change our amendment; have an effect on what – let’s say administration – can or will or could possibly do in any particular case whether that sentence is there or “responsibly” is there? Does it have a change in that?

**FISHER:** [comment indistinct] that question is [comment indistinct] is – is –

**SHERMAN:** I just want to know what –

**FISHER:** It’s a resolution.

**SHERMAN:** Yes.

**FISHER:** We can’t, you know, it’s not policy. And maybe I’m wrong, but as I understand it a resolution is a resolution. It’s not policy.

**SHERMAN:** Yes.

**FISHER:** The administration doesn’t have to do anything with the resolution no matter what it says. So if you want, whether the sentence is there to affect the behavior of an administrator – whether the resolution is there I don’t think has any binding impact on behavior of any administrator even – no matter what we happen to say. So I don’t think that question is necessarily apropos. I think – I think – I think the real question is what statement – what public statement – is this body making by endorsing this particular resolution? And the public statement we want to be making – and I don’t know if you disagree with me or not – but the public statement I feel we want to be making is the strongest possible statement defending

academic freedom and faculty governance, and I don't think – I don't think that sentence adds to that statement. I don't think it makes it a stronger statement in favor of either academic governance, you know, either faculty governance or academic freedom. I think it, in fact, weakens it as a statement for the reasons Bradley very much started with. And so that – that, you know –

**SHERMAN:** Okay.

**FISHER:** – that's why I think the amendment should be in it.

**SHERMAN:** Okay, thanks. Steve and then –

**LEVINSON:** My response is that I – my wish would be to see this policy revisited and rewritten. I would put that on the agenda of the Agenda Committee to consider bringing it forth to this body and/or to the UFC, because I think it's been almost ten years and we do have a – a certain change in climate, so this is kind of a provisional action you might say that's taking it [comment indistinct] revisit the policy.

**GLAZEWSKI:** Could you repeat the statement? We can't hear.

**LEVINSON:** Sorry, my personal position is that this is a provisional action and that we should undertake a revision of the entire academic freedom policy in the near future.

**SHERMAN:** I'll get to you, Jon. Steve, you had a – ?

**SANDERS:** I guess my concern would be that – that the – as amended the policy would be a policy, or – or a resolution affirming maximal faculty free speech rights and ask you to consider is that the same thing as academic freedom? In other words, why do we have protections for faculty speech? It is because we believe that – that institutions need to be neutral to not take sides that – that – truth emerges from debate and from peer review and from exposing bad ideas and – and – and – and bad policies. To me it necessarily implies that the right of one to speak is within – is set within a larger context of an institution's mission, and the institution's mission is to be as much as possible a neutral, open forum. I – I would disagree. I think taking the moderating, or precatory, or whatever you want to call it, language out and only asserting the right of faculty to say what they want to say whenever they want to say it, responsibly or irresponsibly, does change the nature of the policy. What would the public make if they know the B – Faculty Council had a resolution in front of it such as this and chose to take out words calling for responsible utterance, and for exercising an obligation to be accurate and to showing respect for the rights of others to express their views? I – I guess I – I suggest that – that the resolution now does balance the right of speech with the reciprocal notion of membership in an academic community. And I would simply say, Ben quoted the AAUP policy an older – the – the

Ur-policy of the AAUP – the 1915 *Declaration on Principles of American Academic Freedom and Tenure* [sic] includes the following statement, “In their extramural utterances, it is obvious that academic teachers are under a peculiar obligation to avoid hasty or unverified or exaggerated statements, and to retain from intemperate or sensational modes of expression.”<sup>4</sup> The AAUP has not repudiated or taken back the idea that yes, faculty speech and expression must be strongly protected and faculty are not subject to the institution’s control, but it is within the broader understanding of the purposes and the reasons for universities to exist and for academic freedom to exist that there must also be a mutuality of respect and an appreciation for accuracy of statement.

**SHERMAN:** Okay, Jon? And then I – I want to note that we’re at 32 minutes and this isn’t going on indefinitely one way or another. But Jon, why don’t you have – ?

**MACY:** I’ll try – I’ll try to be brief, but I want to reiterate that what Ben said about the changed context in which we work, and I think Steve gave a great point to make to the 19<sup>th</sup> century about an academic community, but in terms of actually what’s going on now people, academics, are being – in Steven Salaita’s case – effectively [comment indistinct] or attacked for not what they say in the university, not what they say in something we might imagine as a community, but for what he said on Twitter. What is the community of Twitter? It’s a network perhaps, but to which community was he responsible? To his own community? Was that the university? Was that the Palestinians? He has a right in the place of what he takes to be war crimes and which the UN would probably take to be war crimes to be intemperate, but he was attacked by – he was counterattacked if you like – because there was a war going on on social media. The reason we need to revisit this language – I very much agree with Bradley – is it’s not written for our time. It’s not written for this context. It’s not – it’s not written about – to be about what happened in the academic community. For that reason I’d agree that we need to – we should not reiterate that sentence now [comment indistinct] but we do need to rewrite this sentence, or to rewrite this policy.

**SHERMAN:** So I – this could go on for a long time as I can see, and I promised that to get the other items on the agenda that we’re beyond that stopping point. Is your pleasure to vote on this amendment now? To table the issue until the next meeting, and take – we will take it up where we left off today?

**ROBINSON:** Vote on the amendment first.

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.aaup.org/report/1915-declaration-principles-academic-freedom-and-academic-tenure>. Section 3. The Function of the Academic Institution.

**SHERMAN:** Vote on the amendment now and then go back and continue discussion on the – on the resolution as a whole, or to simply stop at this point and take up the amendment as the first thing next time. Yeah, do you have – yep, please.

**GLAZEWSKI:** Well, are continuing conversation?

**SHERMAN:** No.

**SPANG:** No.

**GLAZEWSKI:** Okay.

**SHERMAN:** I'm not going to recognize –

**GLAZEWSKI:** Then I pass.

**SHERMAN:** The – the – the conversation could go on indefinitely, and I –

**SEIGEL:** Because there are certain issues...

**SPANG:** So we need a motion –

**SHERMAN:** And there are, so are you saying – ?

**SEIGEL:** Can we – can we vote to have – give ourselves more time to discuss?

**SPANG:** No.

**SEIGEL:** Can I just point out that –

**SHERMAN:** If you want – excuse me –

**SEIGEL:** Jim –

**SHERMAN:** Excuse me – I have the floor.

**SEIGEL:** Yes you do.

**SHERMAN:** I've been more – it's 5 – I – I told ahead of time that there are people here who are scheduled who can't come at another time, and if this requires more time we will simply give it more time at another time. If you want to speak then maybe someone will want to speak, and then someone else will want to speak. And I don't want to –

**SEIGEL:** Can I just point out that this is the first time we have ever obeyed a time limit on any issue in the meetings that we've had. We've gone over on every other thing that we have [comment indistinct] –

**SHERMAN:** That – that is not true at all. I’ve been here many times and it is not true. So please don’t say things that you don’t know are true or false.

**SEIGEL:** In those meetings that I’ve been a part of.

**SHERMAN:** You’ve been to how many meetings?

**SEIGEL:** Three.

**SHERMAN:** Yeah, well, excuse me. Yes, Basu?

**BASU:** Jim, can we say that yes, if we table this, in the next meeting when we pick this up, this could go on as long as it takes?

**SHERMAN:** No!

**BASU:** Okay.

**SHERMAN:** At the next meeting MaryFrances McCourt will be here, her only chance to be here. She’s coming from Indianapolis. She has important things to say, and I will not put her off either. If – if you would like to schedule a special meeting of this body to deal with only this issue, the Executive Committee could take –

[Multiple indistinct comments]

**BAILEY:** Could we vote on the amendment?

**LEVINSON:** I would like to so propose –

**BAILEY:** Could we vote on the amendment, please? [comment indistinct]

**UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** Call the question.

**SEIGEL:** Let’s vote on the amendment.

**FISHER:** Call the amendment.

**TERRY:** We have to first have a vote to end discussion on the amendment. If that passes, then we end discussion on the amendment and we vote on it.

**SANDERS:** Which is not debatable.

**TANFORD:** You do not need a motion to suspend discussion. The chair can call for a vote if there’s no objection.

**TERRY:** Yeah, that is another option.

**TANFORD:** It takes a majority to end discussion and two-thirds.

**TERRY:** Yeah, yeah.

**SHERMAN:** I – I – I’m happy to do that. I don’t want to cut off discussion that some people want to have that would be valuable. If you feel it would be better to have a special BFC meeting devoted to only this issue and no other, without any time constraints, I’m happy to try to arrange that. Maybe it is the best way to proceed, because then we don’t come up against any other items and people here for specific purposes. Would you like me to try to do that? It, you know, I would try to find the best time, but it doesn’t mean that everyone who is here would be able to make such a meeting, in which case I would suggest you find someone to sit in for you.

**SANDERS:** The chair could entertain a motion to move the previous question that would end debate on the amendment, bringing the amendment to a vote. It’s non-debatable and requires a two-thirds vote. Would someone like to move the previous question or move the amendment?

**KARTY:** I move the – the amendment.

**TERRY:** Which is the previous question, second part.

**SANDERS:** Non-debatable, requires a two-thirds vote.

**SHERMAN:** Okay, all in favor?

**FISHER:** [comment indistinct] repeat it?

**MCCLOSKEY:** I’m sorry, what are we voting on?

**UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER:** What are we voting on?

**TERRY:** We’re ending debate.

[Multiple indistinct conversations]

**KARTY:** To close the debate.

**SANDERS:** To close debate.

**UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** On the amendments.

**SPANG:** To close debate on the amendments.

[Multiple indistinct conversations]

**UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** To close debate on the amendment.

**TERRY:** No, the amendment.

**SPANG:** On the amendment. Close debate on the amendment.

**SHERMAN:** Is someone counting?

**DETHLOFF:** All opposed?

**TERRY:** So we vote on the amendment.

**SPANG:** And all opposed?

**DETHLOFF:** All opposed?

**SHERMAN:** Okay, seeing none –

**SPANG:** Abstentions?

**SHERMAN:** Seeing none, then we will take a vote on the amendment as put forth by Bradley and David, one or the other, or both. Okay? All in favor of the amendment?

**LEVINSON:** I think we need a [comment indistinct]

**SHERMAN:** We need what?

**LEVINSON:** We need a reading of the amendment [comment indistinct]

**SHERMAN:** I hope it's clear. We're cutting out the word "responsibly" and the last sentence.

**UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER:** And we're cutting.

**FISHER:** And the adding's already passed.

**SHERMAN:** The adding passed.

**FISHER:** [comment indistinct]

**SPANG:** Yeah.

**SHERMAN:** So –

**SPANG:** That was a friendly.

**SHERMAN:** So – all – all in favor of this amendment, signal.



[Multiple indistinct comments]

**UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** Who's in favor of it?

**SEIGEL:** In favor of [comment indistinct]

**TERRY:** Of the amendment.

**DETHLOFF:** Twenty-five in favor.

**SHERMAN:** All opposed?

**DETHLOFF:** Eighteen opposed.

**SHERMAN:** What's the scorecard?

**DETHLOFF:** Abstentions. If you didn't vote in favor – two abstentions? That's the only two abstentions?

**SPANG:** Some people just haven't voted.

**DETHLOFF:** Some people haven't voted.

[Multiple indistinct conversations]

**SHERMAN:** You don't have to vote.

**SPANG:** It passes, 25 to 18.

**SHERMAN:** 25 to 18? So the second amendment passes 25 to 18, and now would you like to simply take this up as a – another perhaps thirty minute chunk of time for the resolution itself at the next meeting or would you prefer to try to set up a special meeting to deal with this resolution only? Are there other amendments that are going to be offered? Let me – let me ask that.

**SIEGEL:** Yes.

**MACY:** Yes.

**TERRY:** Okay.

**FISHER:** There are two additional amendments. Perhaps we could deal with them in thirty minutes, if we don't have to rehash everything that's happened so far?

**SHERMAN:** Okay, and if we can't we'll stop again and continue again?

**FISHER:** That seems fair to me.

**SHERMAN:** Okay. Alright then, at the beginning of the next meeting, assuming that it's not just totally jam packed at this point, or the meeting after, I – I really have to look at the next agenda, it's going to be pretty tight. There are – so we will – we will take it up either at the beginning of the November 4<sup>th</sup> meeting or at the beginning of the November 18<sup>th</sup> meeting. Okay. Let's move on then to the next item on the agenda which is the enrollment report, and David Johnson, the Vice Provost for Enrollment Management will make the presentation.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 5: ENROLLMENT REPORT: FRESHMAN CLASS UPDATE AND RECRUITMENT FOR HIGH ABILITY/LOW INCOME STUDENTS**

**JOHNSON:** Thank you, Professor Sherman, and faculty and students who may be here as well. It's a pleasure to be here before you this afternoon to give a brief presentation on our enrollment.

"The rate of change is not going to slow down anytime soon. If anything the competition in most industries will probably speed up even more in the next few decades," – John Kotter, a respected authority on the topic of leadership and change. I think it's appropriate for our conversation today as we think about and look at information around demographic shifts, socioeconomic shifts, and affordability questions. So to get underway, and I'll stay within my ten minutes, we going to first look at a definition. Well, what's a "freshman?" Or what are "beginners?" And so there's lots of different definitions here, but we're going to focus kind of on the word "beginner" – "beginners," because you'll see in a few minutes that some beginners are not freshmen as we go through the slides. So we give you some context about these beginners. So we're not talking about transfers. We're not talking about graduate students and intercampus or external transfers. These are beginners, the freshman cohort, as you quite often hear as well. We had a large class 7,716 of academically prepared class of 3.73 median GPA, and of course more diverse as well, with a 10% increase in the Hispanic student population, a 7% increase in African American. 1 in 4 are direct admits, and 1 in 3 were in the top ten percent of their high school class. So this is a quick overview of some of the details about the class. And I will say up front before I dive into this – this effort to recruit students is a collaborative effort, we work with the school and departments and many of you. This is not a work in progress by ourselves. It's a work in progress by everyone working together on this. We work with our various peers around campus, faculty and staff. So let's start with the student. Here's Evan. He is a self-taught musician as you can see with guitar, drum, trumpet, and piano. He's a member of the Hudson and Holland Scholars Program, and has received scholarships through that program. And he is a freshman or a beginner, and a member of the class of 2018 Recording Arts major in the Jacobs School of Music from Indianapolis. And we talked about demographic challenges. I mentioned that, a challenging national environment, for sure. The

US public high school graduates by race and ethnicity, and as you can see on this slide, where the line is drawn, that's the year that we just enrolled this fall. Yes, at the bottom of this cliff so to speak, we enrolled 7,716 beginners, and as we move forward and we have a growing – beginning to have a growing – high school graduate population it's not all things equal though, is it? We have decreases in white students and black students and in Asian students, and increases in Hispanic students, and so – demographic shifts. Socioeconomic shifts can be connected to that as well, and as we talked about the affordability conversation is front and center in this regard. If we bring it a little closer to home, even more challenging in Indiana as you see, the declines in all populations except the Hispanic population. And we are the only state in the Midwest that is flat in terms of loss of students, high school graduates. In the coming years every state around us is – is decreasing in high school graduates, and so they're going to be coming after our students more than they ever have before. So in terms of meeting enrollment targets, we have a 7,500 enrollment target, but also connected to a budget target, as has been pointed out. And we did meet our enrollment and budget target and have slightly surpassed that over the last couple of years. So the mix of our class 56% resident, 9.5% international, and 34.1% domestic nonresident. We enroll more Indiana resident beginners than any other campus in Indiana. I wanted to make sure that you knew this point of the 56.4% that are residents. And then we have, of course, the record GPA, this just shows you the trend over time since 2007. This is when I began working at IU, and in my current role in 2011, and then the near record SAT of 1215, and then enrollment interests. What do students want to study? What are they – what are they in when they begin this fall semester? These aren't direct admits of course, these are pre-, you know, pre-business, pre-College, and then you can go all the way through. You see the University Division portion at 814, and then the Media School 174, and the new School of Global and International Studies is at 75. So you can find your school on here, as well. Direct admit programs is one way we want to look at top students. I'm going to show you three areas that bring top students to us or three things that top students are interested in. One is, of course, direct admits. You know this from your school and – and – and your departments. We've had an increase in direct admit program. We had a 1% increase over last year. There's 2,000 students in the cohort, 2,000 out of the 7,716. And you can see the median GPA and the SAT for this group is very strong. Direct admit. Next, Hutton Honors College, this is about 1,000 students. Some of them are also direct admit, but not necessarily all of them, right? But a thousand students in this category. Mean SAT and the median GPA there as well. 13% of the class and again the 26% direct admit. And then a third category is beginner students who start at IUB with sophomore class standing, so that's why we are careful about the language. They are beginners who are not freshmen. They are sophomores and 9.5%, and if we stay on this trajectory – I've shared with you last year in a different view but if you recall, if we stay on this trajectory by 2020, the Bicentennial, 20% of your students, our students, beginners, could be sophomores – potentially. And so this begs the

question certainly of who you will teach and what you will teach, and this also leads into the points about programs that we are working on in terms of three-plus-two and four-plus-one, that many schools and departments are considering on campus, and in order to meet the expectations of students who arrive on campus as sophomores already. And then –

**MCCRORY:** If I can just add in for one second. For 2014, you'll see that almost 100 of those students are in DEMA programs, so that increase is actually similar all the way up, and the projection for students who are low income, first generation, underrepresented minority students.

**UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** What percentage?

**MCCRORY:** Well, it's not the percentage it's an absolute number, so it's almost 100.

**JOHNSON:** Thank you, Martin. And, where are we getting students from? So 89 of the 92 counties and 47 of the 50 US states, and that's just this year. We have students enrolled here from 50 US states, but this year we didn't get some states – three states – in the beginner cohort. And 42 non-US countries for the 731 international students involved in the beginner cohort. So we also provided for merit awards – 400 plus – almost 400 more awards than the previous year, but on a smaller budget. So some students did get less, some students got the same as they would have in the previous year, and some students would have gotten more if they were in a different cohort – if they were in a cohort from a year before or so... Yes?

**TRIX:** You said there were 731 international students. You gave a 10% increase in Hispanics and 7% increase in African Americans.

**JOHNSON:** Yes.

**TRIX:** Can you give me the numbers of students on those?

**JOHNSON:** Yes, I can. I have them right here. 336 African Americans and 405 Hispanic students.

**TRIX:** Thank you.

**JOHNSON:** We have two or more races as well. We can give that, if you're interested. So, what does this all lead to as I am wrapping up my ten minutes here? We want students to be retained – right? – and to graduate. So I always want to show you this so you see where we sit, where we stand, within the Big 10 because – why the big 10? – not just for fun with the athletics. This is our competition. We look at this. Every. Single. Year. And this is our competition, and so you can see we're at 90% which is strong for the Big 10 retention rates

from the 2012 beginner cohort – freshmen to sophomore retention. But – but there’s Michigan State and Purdue might be aspirational positions that we’d want to be in at the 91% or 92%.

**SWANSON:** So that’s just between the first year and the second year?

**JOHNSON:** Yes.

**MCCRORY:** Yes.

**JOHNSON:** Yes, and then I have the four-year graduation rate.

**MCCRORY:** Let me just add in for the main DEMA programs for Hudson and Holland it’s a 95.9% retention rate for our students at Hudson and Holland, so we’re up there with the top with Wisconsin and Maryland. For Groups, we’re at 90%, well 89.3%, so right around what Indiana’s overall rate is, and for 21<sup>st</sup> Century we’re 87.3%, somewhere around Iowa and Nebraska.

**JOHNSON:** So some of that data you were just sharing, Martin, does reflect the strength of support programs for students – students through the Groups program and Hudson and Holland, the strengths of those support programs. So our four-year graduation rate, we actually do better than some that were above us on retention. So by the time four years comes around, Rutgers, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Michigan State and Purdue are below us, along with Nebraska.

**SEIGEL:** I’m sorry – what – what is the [comment indistinct] there?

**JOHNSON:** This is the four-year graduation rate 58% – sorry, yeah it’s hard to read there – 58%. So again, we might aspire to be where Penn State or Maryland are in this position. And then finally here on this dataset, the six-year graduation rate, Michigan State and Rutgers 79%. We’re at the 77% still with Minnesota, Purdue, and Iowa and Nebraska the lowest on this set, six-year graduation rate. So to put – to also tell you that from the enrollment management perspective there are things that we can do within our purview to call students who have a bursar balance so they can get that paid or help them find a way to pay that so they can register for the next term. To e-mail or phone, text students who haven’t registered yet for the next term to make sure they go see their advisor and make sure that they know that it’s time to get registered. And also financial aid, scholarship counseling for current students, not just for perspective students, to promote the idea of appropriately using financial aid and scholarships through their time at IU. And then also the efforts that we are working with through the first-year experience with our colleagues on academic advising and career services in other areas to enhance the student experience at IU. All things within our purview to either do or partner with colleagues on campus to help, hopefully, from our perspective to move us up in some of these numbers.

**GLOMM:** Do you – do you have information on these numbers by school? By discipline? By major? Or – ?

**JOHNSON:** Yeah, the institution. We do have that. Absolutely.

**GLOMM:** How big is the varying – if I look at the six-year graduation rate, how big would be the variance across schools?

**JOHNSON:** Yeah, that's a great question and I wouldn't want to try to attempt to answer it right now. I don't know the – the answer. I'd have to dive into the data. They are here, we can do that. We can – so to wrap up on this, students are interested in ultimately getting a job when they get out of college. It is a top driver for college choice along with career academ – excuse me – core academics, your programs, your classes, the things that you teach. And affordability of course is front and center for students still. So these are the top three drivers that we have through the Eduventures survey that we participate in, and so to answer this desire to hear about career preparation, we send communications to students like this that tell them we have clubs and organizations they can get involved in, that 62% of our students participate in internships, we have over 1,000 employers that come on campus, and so they can have opportunities and that 3 out of 4 IU students get jobs within the first six months of graduating. We want them to know that when they're thinking about the affordability and value proposition of an IU degree that the education that they're going to receive here is strong because of the efforts that you put in place in the classroom, and their efforts that they put into place to learn, and then the services that they've had and the opportunities they have are strong as well. So, finally, we'll meet one last student here in this portion, and this is Holly. She's one of our out of state students. She's from Calabasas, California. She's one of the 230 students from California this year, and we have a 30% increase in students from California. She's on a scholarship at IU and she's, of course, a freshmen beginner in the class of 2018 in Kelley School of Business. So this wraps up this part of the overview, which we've flown through in hopefully about ten minutes, and then Martin is going to join me. In just a moment we're going to switch gears to the second part of the agenda to –

**SHERMAN:** Why don't we do that?

**JOHNSON:** – and I just have a couple of slides to – to tee this up, and then I'll turn it over to my colleague Martin McCrory. So we have this record underrepresented minority beginner enrollment as we mentioned earlier on the very first slide. This is just a different way of displaying this with that 10% increase in the cohort in Latinos, and 7% in African American to point out those populations. Then this is the first time ever we have reached over 1,000 students – underrepresented minorities – on the Bloomington campus, and so we're pleased. We pause for a moment to celebrate this, but we're not certainly done. We have much more

work to do and much more challenges ahead to make sure we can sustain this growth that we'd like to have. Yes?

**TRIX:** When I add up your numbers I don't get [comment indistinct]

**JOHNSON:** When you add up – oh, because there are other populations that I said – I did – you know, there's two or more races. There are Native Americans, Pacific Isl – native – native Hawaiians. So I can give you all of those. And I'd be happy to send you an e-mail on them.

**TRIX:** Would you please?

**JOHNSON:** Yes, Professor... Trix?

**TRIX:** Trix. ftrix.

**JOHNSON:** Yes, be happy to share that. And then finally, improvements in gift data awarded to underrepresented minority, that is, beginners – sorry, that's covered up there. 69% of underrepresented minority beginners receive IUB gift aid. 47% of all beginners receive IU gift aid. \$29 million was given to this class in gift aid from your schools, your departments, from enrollment management, all IUB gift aid they don't have to give back. \$7 million of that was given to underrepresented minorities. This, I think, is strong commitment from the institution, strong commitment from your departments, in this effort. So we will have more question – Q & A time at the end. I'll turn it over to Martin to talk about his support programs. Professor McCrory.

**MCCRORY:** I'm going to have David play with this because – I'm going to have to apologize – this is the first time I've ever used a PowerPoint slide presentation in my entire life. I've been teaching here for over twenty years and it's always white board or [Laughter and applause].

**UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** Alright, Martin!

**MCCRORY:** So it's always white board or chalk board for me. So I'm not low tech, I'm no tech. So this is – this is new. But I do have my picture right here with Groups students. We're actually – this is funny – I went over to meet with my new director and – let me just say first that I have my new director Mary Tournier, the Director of the Group Scholars Program here with me today. I have Marsha McGriff, the Director of the Hudson and Holland Scholars Program here with me today, and Jim Gibson, the Director of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Scholars Program to help answer questions that you may have about the programs. But I was over – going over to talk to Mary – and I went downstairs and you can't see but there are – I'm only seeing four students there – there must have been, I don't know, fifteen or twenty students studying in that area. They took several pictures of me talking to the students. These students are actually – I think they were studying in 119, the calculus class. We had others who were working on at

writing at the tables and they have instructors, peer tutors with them, and also some faculty members who volunteer their time to come in and help the students. So I was fortunate enough to look at what they were doing. And they were prepping for an exam, and this was great. So I was fortunate enough to take pictures with the students. The Groups Program was actually established in 1968. It's almost fifty years old. Originally it was 48 students. It was originally for African American students. They were trying to get – create a gateway – a pipeline – for African American students in the inner city, primarily in Indianapolis, to come to college. That's not it anymore. It's extremely diverse now throughout all of Indiana. We have now almost 2,000 – I mean, sorry, 12,000 students who've participated in the program. That number's low. We have almost 12,000 now who've participated in the Groups Program, and we try to encourage the students to discover themselves and discover college while they're in the program. I will say that the Groups Program is primarily low income, first generation students, like I said, from all over the state. This year the GPA for Groups was 3.33, which is incredibly high. We have several students in at 2.5, but we had many this year at 4.0 or higher in the program, and that's actually incredible for this program.

**TERRY:** That's their high school GPA?

**MCCRORY:** Yes it is. What does the program provide? Academic advising and mentoring, faculty tutoring, peer tutoring, peer mentoring, faculty mentoring, staff mentoring. It's a need-based scholarship. It's up to the direct cost of attendance for freshman and this year we started and we made the program a six-year program, \$6,000 – up to \$6,000 – according to need for everyone else in the program. So after fifty years we are finally able to make this a four-year program instead of a one-year program and we hope that will – we hope that will increase our retention and graduation rates dramatically. We have stories – these are stories that came to me – where students were working three jobs, some even more than three jobs, just to get through college. And then we wondered why our retention rate was so low, or our graduation rate was six years, seven years, eight years even for students. And the students who didn't graduate after two or three years left with a massive debt, and these are the students who could not afford that type of debt. So we were able to reallocate resources – no new money – and through reallocation we were able to fund this program now for four years. They have their own song –

**SHERMAN:** They do?

**MCCRORY:** Maybe Mary Tourner will sing it for you. [Laughter] They have their own group song and they – we have alums who say that they are Group Students to this day, who've been in the program for, you know, forty years or longer, and actually we have several members of the black caucus in Indianapolis who identify with Groups to this day, and are very interested in the progress of this program. We have a STIM initiative that we do in the summer and continue



it through the year. They do a poster presentation in the summer right in this building, and then they continue on STIM activities throughout the semester and the year. I already told you about this. I have to say it again, because I'm so happy and proud that we were able to make this happen, four-year support for students who need it the most.

**DOCHERTY:** Excuse me, when did the four-year support start?

**MCCRORY:** This year.

**DOCHERTY:** Aha.

**MCCRORY:** I've only been in a year. [Laughter] With Mary Tourner on board we were able to just get down into the books and try to figure out how we could shift things around so we were able to do this [comment indistinct].

Hudson and Holland Scholars Program. Excellent program, best and brightest. Some of the best and brightest at Indiana University. Our GPA this year was 3.87. We have numerous students who are over 4. – 4.0 – I don't if it's 4.5 – at this university. They recruit, retain and prepare students for academic achievement and leadership in the community, and we also teach them social justice. They're required to actually go out in the communities and do social work. It's twenty-six years old and – I don't know – how many people in here know Kevin Brown? Professor Brown? Okay, Professor Brown was – with the heyday of the Groups Program, and in his heyday they had about 80 students per class. Our class this year was 312 students. So we drastically increased the number of students in this program over the last ten years. [comment indistinct] They – I'm probably not a PowerPoint guy – successful post-baccalaureate placement – yeah, move on. Largest class with the most money. 312 students and David told you the type of academic support that – sorry, financial support that we're giving to these students.

21<sup>st</sup> Century Scholars Program. Excellent program. Indiana General Assembly 1990 started this program to get low income and moderate income families to attend college with 100% tuition payment. Seventh or eighth grade – you have to sign up by the eighth grade – and this is – this is sort of a problem. We have numerous students who come to IU as freshmen wondering how they can get into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Scholars Program. It happens so often and is so sad. These are students who could easily qualify or could have qualified, but they don't know in time that they have to sign up by eighth grade. So, actually, David has a program going on this weekend to meet with parents and, Jim Gibson is going to be at that program.

**GIBSON:** It's in Indianapolis, by the way.

**MCCRORY:** Is it? This weekend to tell parents sign up –

**GIBSON:** Sign up.

**MCCRORY:** – get the kids signed up. And all they have to do is stay off the drugs, don't do alcohol, don't go to jail, because –

**TERRY:** Is the state now adequately funding this?

**MCCRORY:** Yes. So I don't know what the future holds, but all the money's there until the students get it. Yes?

**KARTY:** I see more of a – the participation being a guidance counselor problem? I mean if a guidance counselor doesn't know to tell a student this exists then, you know, that person in Porter County might not know about it.

**GIBSON:** There's some guidance [comment indistinct]

**KARTY:** Oh.

**UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** Why not temporary? I mean, that's what I'd ask. Why don't you start [comments indistinct] a couple years later.

[Multiple indistinct comments]

**GIBSON:** Because of state law.

**UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** It's a state law, it's not us.

**TERRY:** Against the law.

**MCCRORY:** And they have to – my understanding is they have to sign up on computer now. So they can't do paper signups. Is that correct?

**GIBSON:** Yes, sir. Yes, they do.

**TERRY:** This is now administered by the Higher Education Commission?

**UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** Yes.

**TERRY:** Okay.

[Indistinct comments and laughter]

**MCCRORY:** But all we can do is send people out to the middle schools and say please sign up. The money's here. While the money's here, please sign up and take full advantage of the program. The reason it's so great is the IUB Covenant. So what the state doesn't pay for, we

pay for. And we're the only state school in Indiana that does this. So we pay for room and board. We pay for books. We pay for lab fees...

**GIBSON:** Some of them, yes – some of them, yes.

**MCCRORY:** So that's our Covenant. We will match it and help pay for things that the state doesn't pay for. So we try to make sure students are aware of that. We have an interesting story of a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Scholar who was in Fort Wayne and he said that he was going to go to Fort Wayne – IU Fort Wayne – because, you know, it's in his hometown and then he happened upon – he says this – as he was throwing away all the brochures he happened to see an IUB Covenant brochure. He opened it up, looked at it and said, 'I can go to Bloomington for free. I'm not going to Fort Wayne.' [Laughter, comments indistinct]

**TERRY:** We're still – this will make more sense when the athletic director is here. We're still primarily covering direct costs of attendance not full cost of attendance, is that correct?

**MCCRORY:** That is correct.

**GIBSON:** That is correct, yes it is.

**MCCRORY:** What do they do? A lot of the students, I think most of the students are first generation –

**GIBSON:** Yeah, about 90% – 95%.

**MCCRORY:** 95% of the students are first generation students. People may not know most of those students are majority students, not minority students, and [comment indistinct]

**GIBSON:** Yeah, the largest region that we get our students from is southwestern – a little bit of southeastern – Indiana. What I lovingly call, "Farmland Indiana." And I can say that, because I grew up on a farm. [Laughter]

**MCCRORY:** So it's actually a totally different world when they come to Bloomington, Indiana and come onto our campus, and the same thing for first-year minority students. So Jim's job is to make them feel at home on the campus and make them not go home every weekend, which is a big problem for all first generation students, but especially rural students. This – this place is just so massive and so intimidating for the students so he makes the large university feel small. We have a lot of support mentoring, tutoring, et cetera... to help students, but also one on one counseling. One of the things that Jim does that's very important, this last bullet point. And it's actually what all of my directors do, they help the parents and students – oh, I'm sorry – make it the third one. I told you these PowerPoints are going throw me off. Support to the parents

and the families as well as the students because the parents a lot of times do not want their children coming to college. They want them staying at home.

**TERRY:** Yes.

**MCCRORY:** This really happens a lot. And when they call up and the student says, 'I have – I have an exam and the professor's – doesn't care about me, and the class is big,' and the parents say, 'Well, come home. Just come home and we'll – we'll talk about it.' It's absolutely the worst thing to do, and when I speak to the parents during orientation, we just had one a couple of months ago, and I said, "Do not tell your students to come home." In fact, say, you know, "Buck up," and, you know, "Just walk it off. This is part of college." I said, "It's going to be hard for you, but you have to do it." You absolutely have to stay. So Jim does that and so do all my directors, but also they get to know the families and a lot of times there are family issues that come up and Jim and Marsha have to deal – and Mary have to deal with family issues. Jim is actually, I do not want to name a student, but Jim is actually dealing with an issue right now that happened to one of his students, and dealing with the families, and helping the families cope. Also Mary and Marsha are dealing with problem – a family problem. They get involved directly with the families to help with family problems on a regular basis and I – I don't know if I could do this. Yes?

**TRIX:** I don't know if this would be useful, but I've got some graduate students [comment indistinct] families to go to college and I wonder if they could be useful in some ways. I've got graduate students who went to community college and then went – I have one who went to community college and then went to Smith College and she's doing her dissertation on class. Surprise, surprise. But I think there are some graduate students who'd be really valuable in talking to students like this. I mean they have lived it, too. Sometimes we forget that graduate students have this experience.

**GIBSON:** This would be so useful. I mean, I'm first generation, but I am old. [Laughter] So it would be much better if you have students closer to their age who came and talked to them.

**TRIX:** And these have rural backgrounds, too.

**MCCRORY:** Sure.

**TRIX:** I – I mean I've – I've just got a really fine seminar where the students are – you know – let me know of some of these backgrounds that I would never would – would have guessed, and I just think they would be very valuable.

**GIBSON:** I would answer your question by saying yes, yes, and yes please. And I will make sure you have my business card so that we can talk and give those folks a call. We'd love it.

**TRIX:** Yeah.

**MCCRORY:** So we already talked about the Covenant covers direct cost as you said, Herb. And we also have had 100% growth in the program since 2007. A lot of students. And then the last picture is one of our students who – last year was it, Mary, this happened? – a Group student who, actually someone ran into his house. The woman went into seizures, drove her car into his house. Car was crushed. I wish we had a picture of the car and the house. But the car was crushed. She was trapped in the crash, so semi-conscious. Her kid was in the back seat crying. Keon took his brothers and sisters out of the house, got them across the street and then went back and saved the little boy, and pried the mother out of her car, and was able to keep her stable until the police and the ambulance came. So he's heralded as a hero. So he's a – a really great guy. I've met him a couple of times. So that's all I have for you today. Yes, sir?

**GLOMM:** Do you have any data on how well the 21<sup>st</sup> Scholars – Scholars do in terms of retention to the second year, four-year graduation rates, because the program's been in place for a long, long time. So what is – ?

**MCCRORY:** Marcia, do we have continuation after the first year?

**MCGRIFF:** Yes.

**MCCRORY:** We only came prepared for first year because that was all that David had on this slide, so we tried to match that up, and [comments indistinct] has that data.

**MCGRIFF:** Yeah, I have up to six-year completion rates for all of the current [comment indistinct]

**MCCRORY:** So, for 21<sup>st</sup> Century in particular?

**MCGRIFF:** Okay, for 21<sup>st</sup> Century in particular, the first year completion rate of the cohort without [comment indistinct] 88.1%; two-year retention rate of the 2012 cohort was 80.5%; and three-year retention for 2011 cohort was 73.5%; 2010 cohort retention rate four-year was 20.2%; five-year retention rate for 2009 cohort was 7%; and six-year retention rate for 2008 cohort was 5.9%.

**GLOMM:** Are these the cumulative or from year to year?

**UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** Year to year.

**GLOMM:** Year to year.

[Multiple indistinct comments]

**SPANG:** It means they're still here.

**GROTH:** They're still on campus, but there's a chunk that have graduated. We know that.

[Multiple indistinct comments]

**MCCLOSKEY:** They graduate in under four years?

**GROTH:** [comment indistinct]

**MCCLOSKEY:** Well, what's the graduation – the four-year graduation rate?

**MCGRIFF:** I do have four and six-year graduation rate.

**MCCRORY:** What is four-year graduation rate?

**MCGRIFF:** Four-year graduation rate for 20 [comment indistinct] cohorts for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Scholars Program is 48.5%.

**MCCRORY:** And that may seem low, but if we go back to the charts that we had earlier – yeah, I know but –

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** [Indistinct]

**JOHNSON:** The entire campus average is 58%. Students who are at a significant financial disadvantage and sometimes their academic background disadvantage as well – 48% is not far off.

**MCCRORY:** We had also – it's the same as Michigan State and Iowa with their entire four-year graduation rate. So at 48.5%, I mean, that's the thing. I mean, if you look at Hudson and Holland at 63.3%, which is much higher than Indiana's 58%, we're up with Penn State, Maryland and Illinois. 48.5% for 21<sup>st</sup> Century around Michigan State and Iowa, and Groups is about 36.2% which puts us right around Purdue, between Purdue and Nebraska, in the Big 10. So our rates may seem low compared to Indiana, but compared to overall rates in the Big 10, we're actually pretty high.

**MCCLOSKEY:** Right. I mean, of course, you want them higher but, you know, obviously, that's why we have a program is to raise awareness.

**MCCRORY:** That's exactly right, and every year we're going up. Every year. I mean it was like less than 25% a couple of years ago. It's 36.2% for Groups now, so we went from less than a quarter to well over a third of the students who are graduating in four years.

**SHERMAN:** Cassidy?

**SUGIMOTO:** To shift gears a little bit. I want to thank you for all of the work that both your offices do. But I want to ask a question about mentoring success, particularly whether growth is a metric of success. So on your first slide it seemed to equate bigger with better, right? You talk about all of these positive things – 10% was higher diversity, more academically gifted, although I would say that with the medians you give both [comment indistinct] inflation issues [comment indistinct] those numbers. But largest class is also there as a positive thing – right? – as a positive metric of success. And you talk about your 7,500 enrollment target and exceeding that. Is exceeding your enrollment target considered a positive thing from your office? Do you hope to continue sustaining these kinds of numbers?

**JOHNSON:** Well, when we work on targets and budgets of 7,500, and we – we set these targets in consultation with the deans and/or Council of Deans and with the provost and with our peers in international and other areas we consult with people. Ultimately, the provost works with us and says what she would like to see. 7,500 is the target. And when we are working with 36,000 applications, and 26,000 admits, and you know, to hit it right on 7,500 it's a bit difficult sometimes. And so in those varied populations of resident, nonresident and international, we are above the target on all three this year, some a little more than others. So it's a delicate balancing act, and then to your point about celebrating the large class. I don't say that bigger is better by any means, and we're not continuing to try and grow beyond the 7,500 target, we just landed at this because some yield rates rebounded in some of our populations than we expected actually. They were more like two years ago rates rather than the rate of – of the previous year. But we did choose in that our marketing – with IU Communication's assistance actually – to celebrate the big class, and it is something to be celebrated that – that these students and more Indiana residents than in any other campus are enrolled right here in the beginner cohort than any other beginner cohort. So it's a, you know, there's pros and cons, but bigger isn't always better, and I will stand behind that point and what you raised as a very valid point.

**MCCRORY:** For me it is –

**SHERMAN:** So let me make one final comment and then I do want to move to Claude Clegg so he'll have an opportunity to talk. Whenever this issue comes up of is more better in students, the same analogy comes to mind and I've been criticized for it before, and will again. When I sat on the Monroe County Solid Waste District Board, we used to have the same kind of tension that – on the one had we wanted to reduce trash going to the landfill, and every time we saw greater reduction everyone would cheer, and then on the other hand there wouldn't be enough trash to sustain the landfill. So more was better. So months when you got more trash, this was good! You know, we are – we're in the black now! We're – we're doing well! Whoa, wait a minute, that's... So I don't want to make the analogy between trash in the landfill and students

here. But, you know, there is this tension between more means more money and good, but wait a minute, class size, et cetera, et cetera... With that, and please, I've been criticized for it before – so I take it to heart. Claude, would you please tell us about the faculty side of this now?

**JOHNSON:** As Claude's making his way up, I just want to say thank you for the time –

**SHERMAN:** Yes, thank you for being here.

**JOHNSON:** – for the opportunity to present with my colleague. I also wanted to recognize my staff who've come out this afternoon. From the registrar to various offices on campus, and so in the interest of time I won't go through, but we're delighted to have a great team behind the work that we do. Thank you.

**SHERMAN:** And I – I can say that the – the people from the registrar's office play an incredibly important role in our Educational Policies Committee. I don't know what we would do without them so [comment indistinct]

**JOHNSON:** [comment indistinct] Director of Admissions, Sacha Thieme, and I are meeting with the Educational Policies Committee on Thurs – Thursday of this week. So thank you we'll look forward to more engagement.

**MCCRORY:** And I would like to say if anybody has questions make sure that you e-mail me or catch me after and we can continue the conversation. So I have absolutely no problem talking with you about – and some of you I've already talked to. Herb and I have had –

**SHERMAN:** Yeah.

**MCCRORY:** – an interesting, long conversation in the past, so if you have questions about retention, particularly retention and graduation, come and talk to me about some of the things that we're doing on that.

**SHERMAN:** Quick question –

**HERRERA:** I had a question about the presentation, the PowerPoint, is available – is [comment indistinct] how can we – ?

**JOHNSON:** We can make it available, yes.

**SHERMAN:** Okay, so I think they – they'll make it available to Craig, and Craig will make it available to BFC members, how's that?

**HERRERA:** Okay, that's fine.



**SHERMAN:** Okay. Alright, Claude you're on.

## **AGENDA ITEM 7: FACULTY RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION**

**CLEGG:** Sorry [comments indistinct] Okay, good afternoon!

**TERRY:** Good afternoon.

**CLEGG:** Thank you, President Sherman for the opportunity to speak to colleagues here at the BFC about faculty recruitment and retention. That is [comment indistinct] the data on my laptop as far as your words are concerned, and I can also make available my presentation here. [comment indistinct] I will give it to Craig who can make it available to the general body of the Council. My portfolio as Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Development first, it has to do with faculty retention/recruitment here on the Bloomington campus. It has to do with more or less realizing an institutional value of this, of IU, with regard to diversity, with regard to a certain sort of heterogeneity in regard to our faculty and our student body and our – our staff and so forth. Again my emphasis is on – on faculty. As far as the values are concerned, I believe it's imperative for a 21<sup>st</sup> century institution such as ours to embrace diversity as a positive good. Our problem is not diversity here on the campus. Diversity's a resource and something that we should cultivate. Our problem is inequity that is the sort of representativeness about faculty in regard to the seismic changes that are going on demographically in this country, that are affecting our workplace, our student-age population as Martin and David just – just showed us, in regard to our electorate. It is not the same electorate we elected – we had ten or twenty years ago, and the general population, that is, the professoriate is not reflective of those sorts of seismic changes that are going on. So it's a representation issue – representational issue, and also an equity issue. There's no such thing as standing in place on this, that is, when everything and everyone around you is in motion, you're either going forwards or backwards. There's no such thing as us staying in place or treading water – water when it comes to the representative nature of our faculty. It's not the case that diversity of our faculty would naturally occur. If that were the case it would have occurred at a much quicker pace than it has. It's not the case that it should be an add on. I – I was gratified. I think we all are gratified by the fact that our campus strategic plan is embroidered throughout every single section of it with statements about diversity – action items in regard to diversity, whether it's students, whether it's our faculty, whether it's our embrace of international programs, interdisciplinarity. All of these are about a certain sort of heterogeneity of doing things, and about doing things, and sort of collectivization of our resources here, our diverse resources here as a campus.

First, I probably should have started by letting you know where my office sits. I have a long title, but it's not quite as indicative of the power that I wield as tightly as I meant. Just to give you an organizational schema here. This is what the diversity infrastructure currently looks like

in regards to administration of IU. I am here in the bottom left-hand corner. I report to Vice Provost Tom Gieryn. Tom's Office is the Office of Faculty and Academic Affairs, and I also report to Vice President – Vice Provost Gieryn is a campus level office – so I'm a campus level official, but I also report to Vice President James Wimbush who is Vice President in the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Multicultural Affairs in the system-wide office. Martin and I are colleagues. Martin largely works on the student side of these issues and I am working – with me working on the faculty side. So just to give you a sort of visual when someone says a title that doesn't necessarily stick with most people. I struggle with my own title sometimes it's so long, but just to give you a sense of how I'm situated. Again, two reporting lines to two very important offices.

I had a number of slides that have to do with numbers. I think it might be best, and you probably couldn't see many of these where you are just to really quickly touch on these. Again, I'll send you these – these slides. The first two slides or the first two sections of this slide have to do with representation of African American faculty. Both tenure-stream faculty and the collective instruction of full-time faculty on this campus, and also of Hispanic or Latino faculty on this campus as well. The big takeaway from here is that we look better when you look collectively at our instructional faculty and our rankings than we do when it comes to tenure-stream faculty. For example, the African American part here is ranked by the section to the farthest right which is all of our instructional faculty. We do pretty well. We fall about – and these are 2012 figures. We don't yet have the Big 10 or the CIC figures for 2014, and they're not appreciably different. I know these numbers – some of the numbers – and they're not appreciably different. We're talking about a tenth of a percent and sometimes a hundredth of a percent in regard to differences between 2012 and 2014. The big takeaway is that if you look at us, total faculty, non-tenure-track, tenure-track, full-time, we look better than if you draw out or disaggregate the tenure-stream faculty. Indiana when it comes to African American faculty, all within the universe of all faculty, we rank about four. We've fallen to about seventh when it comes to the Big 10 and these figures 2012. For Latino, we've fallen a couple of spaces if you disaggregate the tenure-stream faculty. [Clears his throat] Pardon me. Everyone is doing badly in regard to Native American faculty, period. No question not having any. As far as I'm aware we have one Native American tenure-stream faculty here. Two? Okay, two? Twice as many as I [comment indistinct, laughter]. 100% more. [Laughter] But everyone's doing badly and we want to do better on all of these. Asian American faculty are technically not underrepresented on our campus, but we certainly want to make sure that their representation stays robust as well. Yes, sir?

**KARTY:** Asian American, does that include Asian born?

**CLEGG:** That disaggregates the international population.

**KARTY:** [comment indistinct]

**CLEGG:** Very quickly, this is the female faculty. All instructional, tenure-stream female faculty as of 2012. Relatively speaking, a third is in this company not too bad for us. Ideally we want that to be half of our faculty percentages. The numbers here because this is a collective, aggregated, cumulative number it hides the sort of asymmetry that's in our ranks when it comes to our faculty and especially when it comes to gender. That is, we have big issues when it comes to women, senior women in the STEM fields and some of the professional schools in some areas – other areas. We actually have schools that are really hurting when it comes to the numbers. So again, in this company where everyone needs to do well on these figures we don't look so bad, but in the scheme of things this figure we want to increase dramatically and especially in those fields – in which we – tech fields, STEM fields, some of the other social science fields and so forth, we want to do much better with those figures as well.

**TRIX:** Excuse me.

**CLEGG:** Yes.

**TRIX:** Our – we would look much worse if we had an engineering school.

**CLEGG:** Yes. Yes. If you look at Purdue, that's why we –

**TRIX:** That's why we look better than we should.

**CLEGG:** Engineering's on the way, as far as I understand. [Laughter]

**TRIX:** It's design engineering.

**CLEGG:** In the interest of time, again I hate to – to rush through this but I know that – I don't know if we're going to get to Tim and – Tom and Jenny today – but in the interest of time a bit more about what I'm doing. My portfolio – how it's concerned. The goal is to cultivate a broad campus-wide leadership when it comes to issues of diversity, in particular when it comes to faculty diversity. It's not enough for us to have one person like myself or two other people or whatever the case working on this. It has to be a collective effort involving a cross section of this university. It has to be integrated. It has to be cumulative, pushing, one direction effort in regard to diversity. Things that I've been doing since I joined the office on August 1<sup>st</sup>. I met with the search committee chairs and members of the search committees. I've been invited to two of our professional schools and I'll be coming to a school or College near you before long as well to talk with your – one your leadership, your associate deans, and your deans about these things. But really the rubber meets the road when it comes to your search committees, how the faculty replicates itself, how the faculty thinks about quality, how the faculty thinks about inclusiveness, how the faculty puts together robust, talented, diverse pools of candidates. I

met with search committee chairs back in September. We [comment indistinct] come up with a new guide for search committee chairs. It's available at our website. It's a living document, so it will be amended and tweaked as needed, but your search committee chairs, your department chair, your program directors and your associate deans have this document. I invite all of you to go to the OVPFAA website and under "Handbooks and Guides" take a look. Suggestions and so forth, I'd be more than happy to have those, but these are important rules of the road in regard to how we should, as a campus, use best practices to enlarge and make more robust the representation of people who have been previously on the margins of various fields more greatly represented in our – our pools of the candidates. Some of the other tools at our disposal, the campus has a strategic recruitment fund and the explicitly purpose of that is to recruit underrepresented minorities and senior women in fields in which they are also underrepresented. This is a very generous arrangement. I think it's one of the more under-advertised resources that we have here on the campus. If you're on a search committee, if you are paying attention to a search committee within your department or program, if your department's going to be doing a search at any given time, and these issues are important to your unit – and I hope that they are important to all units – this particular resource can help in a number of ways. It can be folded into the search itself. Let's say you have a candidate who is not your top candidate, but is a candidate you can imagine having as a college here at IU, whether it's a senior woman in the STIM fields, whether it's underrepresented minorities in various fields, your chair can make a request that the dean will make a request of the vice president for diversity, equity, multicultural affairs, and the provost to use these funds to underwrite the cost of lines for such faculty in those units. A very generous fund for underrepresented minorities. It's 75% of salary and fringes forever – for as long as they are here. For women in fields in – in which they are underrepresented, for senior women it's 50%, so if there's a woman in [comment indistinct] department A, B or C who has not their share of senior women or women more generally, the campus with approval – the campus will underwrite the cost of that person's line, 50% of it for as long as that person is here. As long as they're here at least six years, that is, through the typical tenure clock. I think this it's a generous deal. I think that many faculty don't know about it. I think it's something that we should want to be proud that the university has in place. It shows something I think concrete in regard to the commitment of the institution. I ask you to get the word out about this. I ask you to talk with your – your search committee members, your department chairs and – and others, and have a civil but direct, probing conversation about what – what are doing to make sure that our pools of candidates are as inclusive and as robust as they can be, that our process is one that's transparent, that could stand the light of day, if need be, that we are – put our money where our mouth is – our interest where our mouth is. We're not just saying really nice things about diversity and we're not actually putting together a real plan, and that's one of the things that I'm doing with each of the schools is actually putting together a plan, and some schools

already have plans, which is great. The campus strategic plan process has encouraged other schools to put together plans, which is great. I encourage units to act boldly, to experiment. There's nothing wrong with that. There's nothing wrong with failing as long as there is effort and something learned from the failure. But to do nothing and assume that things are going to take care of themselves is not an option for us if we want to see any sort of movement. So again, I'll ask you all to – ideas that you have – my door is open. Send an e-mail, what have you – however you'd like to contact me. My door is open. I am open to ideas. I don't have all the answers. If I had all the answers, I wouldn't be before you. These are some tough questions in regards to diversity. Again, a room full of PhD's and we haven't figured this out. It's a tough question, okay? It's not always going to be a comfortable endeavor. It's about race and gender and history and privilege and things that many of us study as part of our – our academic and disciplinary portfolios, but we're still not all that comfortable with discussing. We absolutely have to have those discussions in order to make some – some headway on these issues. So again I ask you after this meeting or after we're done here, go back to your departments and ask those questions about what's going on. It won't happen with appointment of a single person or a few people at the campus level. The action's not at the campus level when it comes to faculty recruitment. It's in search committees. It's in department meetings. It's in the hallways with your colleagues. It's in deans' offices. That's where that action is, and again, I ask that you be a part of that, and again, ask questions. And let your colleagues know, again, I'll put this on – I'll give this to Craig. He can make the PowerPoint available. But more importantly, my door is open. I have heard a lot of great ideas since August 1<sup>st</sup> in regard to all the different things that colleagues are already doing, departments are already doing, they'd like to do. They ask – they're asking why we are not doing more of this A, B, and C, and I cannot really give an answer, but that's the sort of collective wisdom that will be needed with the collective effort that we'll have to put forward on these issues.

**NEWMAN:** So I have a question.

**SHERMAN:** Thank you Claude.

**NEWMAN:** One quick question –

**SHERMAN:** One quick question.

**CLEGG:** Yes, Sharlene?

**SHERMAN:** – we usually pride ourselves on ending right away, so please –

**NEWMAN:** So – so everything you talked about has been about recruitment. So I've been here for ten years and I've seen minority faculty in particular come and then disappear, and so when your office also focused on retention it does, you know – I have like two sort of main areas of

concern. One is retention of minority faculty, in particular, and the other is because I'm in the sciences, the complete lack of minority faculty in the sciences, and so my concern is there and what's going to happen as far as – or I just wanted to make sure that somebody's thinking about retention.

**CLEGG:** Absolutely, and I'll try to be – it's an important question that needs more than the sort of brief answers that I give. But absolutely, that's the other at least half of the equation when it comes to recruitment. Actually, we do – we're much better at recruiting people when it comes to [comment indistinct] in some fields, minority faculty than keeping people here. Some of it's clouded issues within units, that is, what's going on within the unit itself in which it's telegraphed to people that they're not quite – not wanted there, that they don't quite belong. They're not finding sources of fulfillment career wise, collegial, et cetera... I think those are issues that – that vary from place to place. I think the hard sciences are going to have issues that the humanities are going to have different sorts of issues, but that's absolutely something that is in the mix in regard to my [comment indistinct] portfolio, that is, if we are recruiting people but we can't keep them, that's as big of a problem as the recruitment issue. And we're going to have churn the system. If you're recruiting the best faculty that you can recruit and that's how it goes. You can recruit the best faculty that we can recruit, people are going to leave, people are going to have options, people are going to be attracted away. Our goal is to increase the institutional stickiness of IU, that is, to give people more reasons to stay or to stick with IU than to leave. But the short answer to your question, Sharlene, is absolutely the retention part is – is key to any sort of recruitment endeavor.

**SHERMAN:** Okay, thank you Claude and David and Martin for coming we appreciate it. [Applause] And please get – get in touch with any of them or their staff, they're available. See you all November 4.

**MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:36PM**